

mons or ten, but even if it cost us ten billions that would not be the greatest objection to war. There are two other objections that are more important.

The second objection is based upon the possible loss of life. How many men would it cost us to take part in this war? A hundred thousand? They have already killed over two millions; one hundred thousand would hardly be enough for our quota in such a war. If we go into this war we can not go in in a stingy way or as a miserly nation. If it is manly to go in, it will be manly to play a man's part and be prodigal in blood and money.

The danger of war with Germany now seems to be passed and the country is relieved to have the American position in the submarine controversy accepted. But while there was a possibility of war—while the question was acute—some of our American papers were insisting that we ought to go to war with Germany at any cost. I do not believe that our people would be willing to send one hundred thousand brave Americans to death because a little more than a hundred took ships that they ought not to have taken into danger zones about which they fully understood. It is not that our people did not have a right to take those ships. Under international law they did have a right to sail on those ships, but great international questions can not be settled on naked legal rights. There are duties as well as rights. Let me illustrate. Every young man, when he becomes of age, has a legal right to leave his home and make a career for himself. He is not compelled to consider either the wishes or the needs of his parents. But, fortunately, most of our young men put their duty to their parents above their legal rights and inquire about the welfare of the old folks before they leave home.

And so every American citizen has duties as well as rights. Do you say that it is the duty of this government to take its army and follow an American citizen around the world and protect his rights? That is only one side of the proposition. The obligations of citizenship are reciprocal. It is the duty of the citizen to consider his country's safety and the welfare of his fellowmen. In time of war the government can take the son from his widowed mother and compel him to give his life to help this country out of war. If, in time of war, the government can compel its citizens to die in order to bring the war to an end, the government can, in time of peace, say to its citizens that they shall not, by taking unnecessary risks, drag their country into war and compel this sacrifice of their countrymen.

In time of riot a mayor has authority to keep the people of his town off the streets until order is restored. Has not the government of a nation like ours as much authority as the mayor of a city? When the world is in riot our government has, I believe, a right to say to its citizens: "You shall not embarrass the government in dealing with this question. You shall not add to your nation's perils. You must keep out of the danger zone until your government restores order and compels respect for the rights of American citizens." But suppose it cost us not one hundred thousand men but a half million or a million. That is not the greatest objection to the war.

Great as is the first objection, based on the possible cost in money, and greater still as is the second objection, based upon the possible cost in blood, there is a still greater objection; viz., that we can not become a belligerent and at the same time remain neutral.

We stand at the head of the neutral nations; the world looks to us to act as mediator when the time for mediation comes. If, for any reason, no matter what that reason may be, we enter this war, we must step down from our high position and turn over to some other nation an opportunity such as never came to any nation before and may never come again!

Then, too, we are the next of kin to all the nations now at war; they are blood of our blood and bone of our bone. Not a soldier boy falls on any battlefield over yonder but the wail of sorrow in his home finds an echo at some American fireside, and these nations have a right to expect that we will remain the friend of all, and be in position to play the part of a friend when a friend can aid.

Some nation must lift the world out of the black night of war into the light of that day when an enduring peace can be built on love and brotherhood, and I crave that honor for this nation. More glorious than any page of history that has yet been written will be the page that

records our claim to the promise made to the peacemakers.

This is the day for which the ages have been waiting. For nineteen hundred years the gospel of the Prince of Peace has been making its majestic march around the world, and during these centuries the philosophy of the Sermon on the Mount has become more and more the rule of daily life. It only remains to lift that code of morals from the level of the individual and make it real in the law of nations, and ours is the nation best prepared to set the example. We are less hampered by precedent than other nations and therefore more free to act. I appreciate the value of precedent—what higher tribute can I pay it than to say that it is as universal as the law of gravitation and as necessary to stability? And yet the law of gravitation controls only inanimate nature—everything that lives is in constant combat with the law of gravitation. The tiniest insect that creeps upon the ground wins a victory over it every time it moves; even the slender blade of grass sings a song of triumph over this universal law as it lifts itself up toward the sun. So every step in human progress breaks the law of precedent. Precedent lives in the past—it relies on memory; because a thing never was, precedent declares that it can never be. Progress walks by faith and dares to try the things that ought to be.

This, too, is the leading Christian nation. We give more money every year to carry the gospel to those who live under other flags than any other nation now living or that has lived. The two reasons combine to fix the eyes of the world upon us as the one nation which is at liberty to lead the way from the blood-stained methods of the past out into the larger and better day.

We must not disappoint the hopes which our ideals and achievements have excited. If I know the heart of the American people they are not willing that this supreme opportunity shall pass by unimproved. No, the metropolitan press is not the voice of the nation; you can no more measure the sentiment of the peace-loving masses by the froth of the jingo press than you can measure the ocean's silent depths by the foam upon its waves.

#### THE THREATENING DANGER OF A MILITARY AUTOCRACY

(Continued from Page 8.)

al clamor for our veteran army to invade and capture Canada. During the war, Confederate cruisers, built in English shipyards and armed in English arsenals, had driven American commerce from the seas and oceans of the world. Had a Napoleon or a Frederick or a Roosevelt been in command at the close of hostilities we would have been plunged into a war with England. Morley said, in his *Life of Gladstone*:

"The treaty of Washington and the Geneva arbitration stood out as the most notable victory in the nineteenth century of the noble art of preventive diplomacy, and the most signal exhibition of self-command in two of the three great powers of the western world."

At Appomattox Grant stood on fame's topmost pinnacle; the foremost man of all the world, but in the treaty of Washington he was greater than at Appomattox.

After Grant had served eight years as president, he made a trip around the world. When in Paris, he was invited to visit the gilded tomb of Napoleon. He declined, saying he would visit the tomb of no general who had won his fame in wars of conquest. When Roosevelt visited Paris, he called on the head of the French army to accompany him to the tomb of Napoleon. He stood there in the presence of that gilded mausoleum with uncovered head, paying the tribute of a bogus American to the man who murdered a million men in useless wars.

#### FORCES THAT WORK FOR PEACE

Edward A. Steiner, who filled the chair of Applied Christianity in Grinnell college, Iowa, an author and student of political economy, says: "The kinship of humanity can do more for peace and good will than all the armies and navies of the world." Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore says: "God grant that the day is not far off when the Prince of Peace, God, will reign over the cabinets of the nations, over the kings, presidents, and settle disputes not with standing armies, but by the international board of arbitration; not by the sword, but by the pen, for the pen is mightier than the sword."

The greatest scholars and sociologists of the world today are men of peace. It is as true today as when that great Englishman, Thomas Carlyle uttered it 85 years ago: "A standing army means

waste, depression, and moral decay. No nation can improve its morals or grow in strength when its bravest and best sons are year by year devoured in the army."

This is the stand taken by the sanest statesmen and the ripest scholarship of the age, and is the only position which will keep this country in the track of empire fixed by the great spirits who framed the constitution and sent the young republic on its career.

The time to end the barbarism of war is to scotch the reptile in the head when we have a chance. We must not forget that for generations the habits of fight are in our blood. Not a thousand years ago our ancestors were raiding the Christian monasteries of England, continuing their deadly marches with the bodies of new-born infants carried on their spears and the entrails of the mothers strung around their necks as trophies.

I quote an extract from the great Rabbi Charles Fleischer, in his reply to President Elliot of Harvard, in which he makes the president look intellectually diminutive:

"The Harvard sage errs in saying that there is no reason why the Jews should not make good fighters. There happens to be the best reason. The Jew has got out of the habit of fighting. He has lost the primitive man's desire to kill, because he has been so long civilized. You can not brutalize him again. I am happy to feel that, in the main, that Elliot's appeal to the Jews must be in vain, because, by long tradition, culminating in native instinct, your average Jew believes that Israel's mission is peace."

In conclusion, I am not for peace at any price. I am for peace until an emergency arises, or when the nation is threatened by a foreign foe. When that occurs, I will offer my services to the country, and vote for as many men and as many millions as the President may ask. But I am not willing to waste the product of labor and more millions of the tax money of the people for a propaganda of militarism, to fasten more parasites on the body politic, when there is no occasion for it whatever.

In 1908, when the republicans were in control of congress, Congressman Tawney of Minnesota, chairman of the committee on appropriations, said:

"The government is spending for military appropriations and for past wars, 68 per cent of the total revenues, exclusive of the postal revenue. For the same period, England spent 42 per cent, France 32 per cent, and Germany 42 per cent."

So we were spending 26 per cent more on militarism than the German empire.

#### LET US RETURN TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

If there was ever a time in the history of the country when this militarism which is now so rampant, should be scotched, that time is now. It should be the effort of every patriotic man and woman to do everything possible to restore this Republic to the simplicity of a democratic government, of the people, for the people, and by the people.

There is no morality, no ethics, no economy in steel cannon and murderous shrapnel. This wicked military project to waste five hundred millions of the people's tax money reminds me of a sentiment of President James A. Garfield, given at a reunion of the Army of Cumberland, ten years after our great Civil war:

"Ideas are the great warriors of the world, and a war that has no ideas behind it is simply a brutality."

In a speech made on the floor of congress March 26th, 1910, in reply to the jingo Hobson, I said:

"Not a single dreadnaught, not another battleship, is the universal voice of every peace-loving, war-hating patriot who loves law and order and justice. No battleship with its cruel messengers of death ever advanced any good cause, any humane mission, on any sea or on any shore around the world. Peace is constructive, war is destructive. Peace is love, war is hate. Peace is quiet and repose, war is hell and uproar. Our mission is to make plain the paths of peace, and not equip more dogs of war to rend them."

In conclusion let me turn from Woodrow Wilson, sane and sober, and not the Woodrow Wilson of today, overwhelmed by the military cabal:

I quote from President Wilson, one year ago: "We never have had and while we retain our present principles, we never shall have, a large standing army. If asked are we ready to defend ourselves, we reply most assuredly, to the utmost, and we shall never turn America into a military camp."

I HAVE NOT CHANGED.